



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re patent application of first named inventor: Alexandros Makriyannis

Application No.: 10/647,544 Examiner: C. AULAKH

Filing Date: 8/25/2003 Group Art Unit: 1625

For: Keto Cannabinoids With Therapeutic Indications

To: Commissioner for Patents, United States Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir,

INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

Date of interview:

3/30/2006

Type of interview:

telephonic

Participants:

- 1) Supervisor C. Tsang
- 2) Examiner C. Aulakh
- 3) Mr. Jim Piotrowski

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:

no

Claims discussed:

11

Identification of prior art discussed:

No prior art was discussed.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. Piotrowski explained Fluorescence generally.

35 USC §112, first paragraph rejection:

Mr. Piotrowski indicated that the specification at published page 17, paragraphs 0251 and 0252 discusses test methods used for fluorescence in the application.

Mr. Piotrowski indicated that the specification at published Table 2 explicitly indicates the absorption of energy (excitation) at the "Fluorescence Excitation Peak" and emission of energy (emission) at the Fluorescence Emission Peak for exemplary compounds.


Supervisor Tsang questioned the method steps of claim 11. Mr. Piotrowski asked that the discussion of method steps in claim 11 wait until the §112, first paragraph rejection had been discussed.

Examiner Aulakh questioned where excitation of a compound by electromagnetic radiation and emission of radiation of electromagnetic radiation by the compound is shown. Mr. Piotrowski indicated that the Table 2 excitation peak values are in nm and in the UV spectrum and the Emission peak values are in nm and are in the UV or Visible spectrum of electromagnetic radiation. There was a further discussion of the background of fluorescence and where the specification disclosed definitions, test methods and test results for fluorescence.

Supervisor Tsang stated she had not reviewed the application and did not know what issues this conference would discuss. Mr. Piotrowski asked if we could adjourn the meeting until Supervisor Tsang and Examiner Aulakh had reviewed the specification so that we could discuss the pending 35 USC §112 first and second paragraph and 35 USC §101 rejections. Supervisor Tsang and Examiner Aulakh agreed to have another teleconference on Thursday April 6th at 10:00.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6-16-2006
750 Main Street- Suite 1400
Hartford, CT 06103-2721
(860) 527-9211

By: 
James E. Piotrowski
Registration No. 43,860
Alix, Yale & Ristas, LLP
Attorney for Applicants